

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-26 are pending in this application. Claim 3 is cancelled because the subject matter of claim 3 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 1, 5, and 21 are in independent form. Claims 2-4, 6-20, 22-23, and 25-26 depend from claim 1, and claim 24 depends from claim 21. Claims 1, 5, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended into independent form and is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

In the office action, claims 1-4, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,542,091 to Rasanen. Rasanen concerns a 10 key keyboard wherein the keys are split into a left side section corresponding to the left hand and a right side section corresponding to the right hand. The keys of the left hand section do not vertically overlap keys of the right hand section, although keys within each section overlap one another vertically. The alphabetic characters in Rasanen are not arranged in a known format. In contrast, claim 1 concerns keys that are arranged in a known key arrangement (such as QWERTY, QWERTZ, AZERTY, etc. (see Spec. at 1, lines 9-13)). In addition, claim 1 requires that the left and right side sections at least vertically overlap one another. Thus, claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Rasanen.

Claims 6-8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0078069 to Lindeman. Lindeman teaches a mobile device that can be used for either messaging in the open position, or as a phone in the closed position. The open position is shown in Fig. 1 and the closed position is shown in Fig. 2. As is clear from Fig. 1, Lindeman does not teach a left and right side section that at least partially vertically overlap one another since the left side 102 and right side 104 sections are horizontally aligned and spaced by a display 106. As discussed above, the same deficiency is present in Rasanen. For this reason, as well as other reasons, claims 6-8 and 18 are patentable over the cited combination.

Claims 9, 15, 23, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, Lindeman and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0190957 to Lee. Lee teaches a

left side section that is horizontally aligned with a right side section, as shown in Fig. 7. In addition, Lee does not teach the method of claim 26 because it does not teach the thumb-typing technique taught by the method claim. Moreover, Lee does not even mention the word “thumb” in its disclosure. For these reasons, claims 9, 15, 23, and 26 are submitted to be patentable over the cited combination.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, Lindeman, Lee and U.S. Patent No. 6,628,961 to Ho. Ho does not remedy the deficiencies, discussed above in connection with Rasanen, Lee and Lindeman. Thus the cited combination is missing at least one element of claim 10, which depends from claim 1. For this reason, claim 10 is submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, Lindeman, Lee, Ho, and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0073414 to Capps. Capps does not remedy the deficiencies, discussed above in connection with Rasanen, Lee, Lindeman, and Ho. In particular, the left and right side section of keys are horizontally aligned and do not vertically overlap one another. Thus the cited combination is missing at least one element of claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 1. For this reason, claims 11 and 12 are submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, Lindeman, Lee, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,119,078 to Grant. Grant teaches a keyboard, shown best in Fig. 7, having a left side section and a right side section. None of the keys in either section vertically overlap keys in the other section. Thus, as with the prior rejections, at least one element is missing from claim 13, which depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 13 is submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasanen, Lindeman, Lee, Grant and Capps. Claim 14 depends from claim 1. Since the cited combination, as discussed above in connection with all the prior rejections, does not provide keys that overlap vertically, claim 14 is submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,626,428 to Miwa. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Miwa and U.S. Patent No. 6,933,926 to Ukita. Miwa concerns a key arrangement where keys of a QWERTY keyboard in each row overlap keys within that same

row, so that the four rows of a QWERTY keyboard are made shorter length-wise. There is no left side section and right side section since all the keys are combined together into a single section, which is obvious from Fig. 2 of Miwa. Ukita teaches a mobile device where keys within each row of a QWERTY keyboard overlap in each row. Ukita is very similar to Miwa. There is no left or right side section. Because there is no left or right side section, the method of claim 24 cannot be followed and the apparatus of claim 21 is not taught. For these reasons, the claims are submitted to be allowable over Miwa and Ukita.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help to resolve any remaining issues.

No fees are believed to be required with the submission of this response, other than the fee associated with a one month extension of time. Should any other fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-1432.

Respectfully submitted,


Lorri W. Cooper Reg. No. 40,038

JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7097

Date: October 22, 2007